


Gallatin County, Montana



Mike Salvagni

County Attorney

615 South 16th Avenue - Room 202

Bozeman, Montana 59715

Telephone: (406) 582-2145

FAX: (406) 582-2158

OPINION NO. 95-23

ZONING - PROTEST REQUIREMENTS

November 9, 1995

Gallatin County Commissioners
County Courthouse
Bozeman, MT 59715

Dear Commissioners:

In my letter dated September 21, 1995, to Shelley Cheney, I alerted you to the 1995 changes to the protest requirements with the creation of zoning districts. For your information, the 1995 Legislature amended Section 76-2-101, MCA, (rural zoning) and Section 76-2-205, MCA, (county zoning). Because the Middle Cottonwood zoning regulations are being processed it is necessary to consider the amendments to Section 76-2-205.

Section 76-2-205(6) now provides as follows:

Within 30 days after the expiration of the protest period, the board of county commissioners may in its discretion adopt the resolution creating the zoning district or establishing the zoning regulations for the district. However, if 40% of the freeholders within the district whose names appear on the last-completed assessment roll or if freeholders representing 50% of the titled property ownership whose property is taxed for agricultural purposes under 15-7-202 or whose property is taxed as forest land under Title 15, chapter 44, part 1, have protested the establishment of the district or adoption of the regulations, the board of county commissioners may not adopt the resolution and a further zoning resolution may not be proposed for the district for a period of 1 year. (Emphasis added).

The emphasized part of the statute was added by the legislature. I have examined the legislative history of the amendments, which were contained in House Bill No. 358. When House

Bill NO. 358 was introduced the amendment read as follows:

Within 30 days after the expiration of the protest period, the board of county commissioners may in its discretion adopt the resolution creating the zoning district or establishing the zoning regulations for the district. However, if 40% of the freeholders within the district whose names appear on the last-completed assessment roll or if freeholders representing 50% of the titled property ownership have protested the establishment of the district or adoption of the regulations, the board of county commissioners may not adopt the resolution and a further zoning resolution may not be proposed for the district for a period of 1 year. (Emphasis added).

The amendment was proposed to give larger land owners input into the creation of a zoning district and zoning regulations. Testimony of Rep. Cliff Trexler, Minutes, Senate Local Government Committee, March 21, 1995. Before the amendment, the protest was limited to freeholders, regardless of the quantity of the property. Each freeholder had one vote in determining the 40% requirement. For example, under this method owners of two small parcels of property (eg. 10 acres) could include a large parcel of property (eg. 640 acres) in a zoning district and subject it to zoning regulations. If the owner of the 640 acre parcel is the only one to protest, there are insufficient protests.

Opponents of the amendment were concerned that the original version of the amendment as cited above would possibly allow one person, who owned a large parcel of property, to determine the health, safety and welfare standards of a community. They were also concerned that large property owners who reside outside of Montana with interests other than agricultural (possibly industrial interests) could defeat zoning proposals made by residents of Montana. To address these concerns the present version, which includes quantity with respect to agricultural and forest land, was adopted.

With this background it is clear from its plain language that Section 76-2-205(6) recognizes the following protests:

1. 40% of the freeholders within the district whose names appear on the last-completed assessment roll;
2. Freeholders representing 50% of the titled property ownership whose property is taxed for agricultural proposes under Section 15-7-202, MCA;
3. Freeholders representing 50% of the titled property ownership whose property is taxed as forest land under Tile 15, chapter 44, part 1, MCA.

If any one of these protests is made, the County Commissioners may not adopt the proposed zoning regulations. The 50% protests are based upon acreage. To determine the 50% protests the following rules and calculations are followed:

1. Determine the total acreage of land taxed for agricultural purposes under Section 15-7-202 and land taxed as forest land under Title 15, chapter 44, part 1.

2. Identify the freeholders of the agricultural and forest land.

3. Freeholders are defined in County Attorney Opinion No. 92-22 (August 29, 1992), the first four pages of which are enclosed. The remaining portion of that opinion has no application to the present issue.

4. For a tract of land to qualify in the protest every freeholder who has title to the tract needs to make a written protest.


5. If a freeholder(s) owns more than one tract of land each tract shall have a separate written protest or be sufficiently identified on one protest with other tracts owned by the same freeholder(s).

6. If 50% of the total acreage of agricultural or forest land is included in the protests made by the freeholders of the land, there are sufficient protests to prevent the establishment of a zoning district or the adoption of zoning regulations..

In County Attorney Opinion No. 92-22 I cite 37 Att'y Gen. Op. 47. In that opinion the Attorney General interpreted Section 76-2-205 before the 1995 amendments. The Attorney General's opinion has no application to the 1995 amendments.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,




Mike Salvagni
County Attorney

enclosure

cc: Gallatin County Planning Board
Shelley Cheney
Dale Beland
Arletta Derleth
Brian Gallik

DISTRIBUTED BY:
CROSBY OPINION SERVICE
2210 East 6th Ave.
Helena, MT 59601
406-443-3418



VOLUME NO. 46

OPINION NO. 22

COUNTIES - Scope of protest rights afforded freeholders subject to proposed zoning districts and amendments of zoning regulations;
FREEHOLDERS - Protest rights to zoning districts and amendment of zoning regulations proposed by county governments;
LAND USE - Scope of protest rights afforded freeholders subject to proposed zoning districts and amendments of zoning regulations;
MONTANA CODE ANNOTATED - Sections 76-2-205(6), -305;
MONTANA LAWS OF 1995 - Chapter 591;
OPINIONS OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL - 37 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 47 (1977).

- HELD: 1. Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) enlarges "protest rights" for freeholders whose property is classified for real property tax purposes as agricultural or forest land, where their combined title ownership represents 50 percent of the total property ownership within the proposed or revised zoning district. These enlarged protest rights supplement the protest rights provided to 40 percent of freeholders within the district whose names appear on the last-completed assessment roll.
2. The phrase "freeholders representing 50 percent of the titled property ownership" within Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) requires that all owners of property held in joint or common ownership join in the protest for the area of the parcel to be included in the calculation of the protest area. Condominium owners or purchasers are entitled to have their proportionate share of the freehold interest in the land area of the particular development included in the calculation of the protest area.

July 22, 1996

Mr. Thomas J. Esch
Flathead County Attorney
P.O. Box 1516
Kalispell, MT 59903-1516

Dear Mr. Esch:

You have requested my opinion upon the following questions:

1. Does Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) provide an enlarged right of protest to: (a) both the freeholders owning 50 percent of the land taxed for agricultural purposes in the proposed district and the freeholders owning 50 percent of the land taxed for forest purposes in the proposed district; or (b) freeholders taxed for agricultural or forest purposes who own 50 percent of all property in the proposed zoning district?
2. Does the phrase "freeholders representing 50 percent of the titled property ownership" within Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) require that all owners of property held in joint or common ownership join in the protest for the area of the parcel to be included in the protest?

These questions arise from a proposed 3761.67-acre Southeast Rural Whitefish Zoning District within Flathead County (hereinafter "zoning district"). The proposed zoning district includes 262 freeholders and is a mixture of land in residential and agricultural use. Classified for taxation purposes as agricultural or timber land are 2993.49 acres. Twenty-eight freeholders of land taxed for agricultural or forest use have submitted protests to the creation of the zoning district. These 28 landowners represent 1708.58 acres or 45 percent of the titled land ownership in the zoning district. The protesting agricultural and timber landowners represent 57 percent of the total acreage within the district classified as either agricultural or timber.¹

¹ The Board of County Commissioners has not yet adopted a resolution of intent to create the district. This action has been stayed pending resolution of your opinion request. Consequently, a formal protest period has not begun and the county has not formally accepted letters of protest. However, letters of protest and intent to protest have been received and the Flathead County Clerk and Recorder was asked to provide the information set forth above for purposes of responding to the opinion request. The Flathead County Clerk and Recorder's office has indicated that only 13 of the 28 protests reviewed would be "valid." These 13 protests, preliminarily determined to be valid, represent 1381.51 acres of the land within the proposed district or 37 percent of the total land area in the district and 46 percent of the lands taxed as either agricultural or timber. Agricultural and timber protests have not been separated and individually tabulated, thus permitting the determination of the percentage of the total land taxed as agriculture land within the district represented by agriculture protests received by the county.

Your opinion request requires construction of Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6). The statute provides:

Within 30 days after the expiration of the protest period, the board of county commissioners may in its discretion adopt the resolution creating the zoning district or establishing the zoning regulations for the district. However, if 40% of the freeholders within the district whose names appear on the last-completed assessment roll or if freeholders representing 50% of the titled property ownership whose property is taxed for agricultural purposes under 15-7-202 or whose property is taxed as forest land under Title 15, chapter 44, part 1, have protested the establishment of the district or adoption of the regulations, the board of county commissioners may not adopt the resolution and a further zoning resolution may not be proposed for the district for a period of 1 year.

The constitutionality of the "protest provision" in question has not been challenged. The zoning statute is presumed to be constitutionally valid, and this opinion does not address the constitutionality of the statute.

There is no controlling decisional law in Montana pertaining to the questions you have presented and the law of other jurisdictions has limited application given the unusual nature of the Montana statute. Opinions of other jurisdictions are premised on the recognition that the protest provisions of those jurisdictions pertain to the amendment of an existing zoning regulation.² The courts recognize that those protest provisions are a form of protection afforded property owners in the stability and continuity of preexisting zoning regulations. Such reasoning is not applicable to the Montana statute, which operates as a form of extraordinary protection afforded property owners to prevent the legislative body from adopting zoning regulations in the first

² Protest provisions allow qualified property owners to formally protest the enactment of a proposed zoning amendment. Protest provisions are generally limited to proposed zoning **amendments** and do not apply to the initial zoning of property. 7 Patrick J. Rohan, Zoning and Land Use Controls § 50.04[4] [a] (1995); 3 Rathkopf's The Law of Zoning and Planning § 29.02[1] (1995). Furthermore, protest provisions generally work to increase the number of votes required by a local governing body to pass a zoning amendment--typically an extraordinary majority or unanimous vote of the legislative body. See, e.g., Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-305. The power of final decision with protest provisions rests with the legislative body to overrule a protest by marshaling the necessary votes. 1 Anderson's American Law of Zoning § 4.37 (4th ed. 1996).

instance.³ As such, the statute operates more like a "consent provision" than a protest provision.⁴ Consistent with these observations, the statute's "protest" rights discussed within this opinion are so identified only for purposes of consistency with the actual language of the statute.

I. The 50 Percent Requirement

Prior to 1995, Montana law provided a statutory right of protest to "40% of the freeholders within the district whose names appear on the last-completed assessment roll." Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) (1993). In 37 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 47 (1977) Attorney General Greely found that this language allowed each freeholder in the district one protest vote without regard to the number of parcels the freeholder owned within the district. The proposed Whitefish zoning district, comprised of approximately 262 freeholders, thus could be defeated if 40 percent or approximately 105 freeholders submitted timely protests.

Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) was amended by HB 358 of the 1995 legislature to enlarge the statutory protest provision described above. 1995 Mont. Laws ch. 591, § 2. The statute, set forth above, was amended by the addition of the language emphasized below:

However, if 40% of the freeholders within the district whose names appear on the last-completed assessment roll or if freeholders representing 50% of the titled property ownership whose property is taxed for agricultural purposes under 15-7-202 or whose property is taxed as forest land under Title 15, chapter 44, part 1, have protested the establishment of the district or adoption of the regulations, the board of county commissioners may not adopt the resolution and a further zoning resolution

³ Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) provides property owners a veto power over the county legislative body with respect to proposals for the initial zoning of property and rezoning proposals. It does not provide for subsequent legislative action; the statute prohibits such action for a period of one year.

⁴ Consent provisions require either that the consent of a certain number or percentage of affected landowners be obtained before a zoning amendment is adopted or that an amendment will not take effect until such consent has been given. 1 Anderson's American Law of Zoning § 4.37 (4th ed. 1996). The only other state statute I reviewed that contains provisions similar to Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) is a South Dakota statute, S.D. Codified Laws Ann. § 11-4-5, which has been interpreted by the South Dakota Supreme Court as a consent provision. State Theatre Co. v. Smith, 276 N.W.2d 259 (S.D. 1979).

may not be proposed for the district for a period of 1 year.

In construing and interpreting statutes, my function is to effectuate the legislature's intent; the plain meaning of the words used in the statute should be first considered. Gulbrandson v. Carey, 272 Mont. 494, 500, 901 P.2d 573, 577 (1995). The intent of the 1995 amendments is difficult to ascertain by reference to the plain meaning of the words used because the language is subject to at least two interpretations, depending on the effect given the modifying phrase "whose property is taxed." The language may be construed as follows:

If freeholders who represent 50 percent of the titled property ownership within the district protest, and if the property counted as meeting the 50 percent limit consists exclusively of property taxed for either agricultural or forest purposes, the establishment of the zoning district fails.

On the other hand, the amendment may be construed to mean:

If freeholders who represent 50 percent of the titled property ownership of land taxed for agricultural purposes within the district protest, or if freeholders who represent 50 percent of the titled property ownership of land taxed for forest purposes within the district protest, the district fails.

A statute is ambiguous when it is capable of being understood by reasonably well-informed persons in either of two or more different senses. 2A Sutherland Statutory Construction § 45.02, at 6 (5th ed. 1992). Without question, the 1995 amendment of Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) is ambiguous on its face.

If the plain words of a statute are ambiguous, the next step in statutory interpretation is to determine the intent of the legislature by examining the legislative history of the statute. Eisenmenger v. Ethicon, Inc., 264 Mont. 393, 398, 871 P.2d 1313, 1316 (1994). House Bill 358 was introduced in order to grant large landowners relief from zoning district proposals that included their property. The bill was entitled: "An Act Changing the Protest Requirement for Zoning Adoption; and Amending Section 76-2-205, MCA." The sponsor of the bill stated that the legislation would add a method by which a zoning district could be protested. Representatives of agricultural and forestry interests supporting the bill noted that the bill would grant protest rights to large landowners not recognized by the current law; large landowners would be treated on an equitable basis with small landowners. See Mins., House Local Gov't Comm., Feb. 9, 1995. In its original form, HB 358 proposed the following amendment to Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6):

However, if 40% of the freeholders within the district whose names appear on the last-completed assessment roll *or if freeholders representing 50% of the titled property ownership* have protested the establishment of the district or adoption of the regulations, the board of county commissioners may not adopt the resolution and a further zoning resolution may not be proposed for the district for a period of 1 year.

The House passed HB 358 in this form.

On March 29, 1995, after the bill had passed the Senate Local Government Committee, an amendment was offered and adopted on the Senate floor. This amendment added language, emphasized below, which created the ambiguity at issue:

However, if 40% of the freeholders within the district whose names appear on the last-completed assessment roll or if freeholders representing 50% of the titled property ownership *whose property is taxed for agricultural purposes under 15-7-202(2)(a) or whose property is taxed as forest land under Title 15, chapter 44, part 1,* have protested the establishment of the district or adoption of the regulations, the board of county commissioners may not adopt the resolution and a further zoning resolution may not be proposed for the district for a period of 1 year.

The legislative intent behind this amendment is determinative of the first question you have presented regarding interpretation of Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6). The amendment was discussed by the Conference Committee that considered HB 358 on April 7, 1995. Minutes of the meeting reflect the following exchange between conference committee members concerning the amendment's intent:

REP. SHIELL ANDERSON asked why it was inserted "who's [sic] property is taxed for agricultural purposes"?

CHAIRMAN BECK said that SEN. LYNCH was concerned about major companies saying if they had a big parcel of land and they could control zoning regulations with that purpose. SEN. LYNCH wanted to specify that it could not be a major company.

SEN. HARGROVE asked if they had seen the concerns about Ashgrove and that was what SEN. LYNCH was concerned about.

REP. BILL RYAN said that SEN. LYNCH [was] referring to the Anaconda Company, they would have controlled everything and no zoning would have taken place.

SEN. DOROTHY ECK said the amendment was looking at company towns.

CHAIRMAN BECK said if the land was classified for agriculture purposes there would not be a problem.

The dialogue suggests an intent to limit the type of large freeholders who would be entitled to invoke the protest right: Freeholders taxed for agricultural and forest use would be given a new protest right; freeholders engaged in industrial or commercial use would not be entitled to a new protest right under the proposed statute. The amendment was thus intended to limit application of the bill's expansion of protest rights.

Returning to the two possible interpretations of Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) set forth above, the first interpretation achieves a result that is consistent with the legislative intent established by the Senate floor amendment of March 29, 1995. This interpretation limits the expansion of protest rights of large landowners by simply clarifying what types of freeholders may receive the expanded rights--those whose property is taxed for agricultural or forest purposes.

The second interpretation effects a reading of HB 358 that also clarifies that only agricultural and forestry freeholders may receive the enlarged protest rights. However, this interpretation greatly expands the protest rights of these types of freeholders. Under the second interpretation, agricultural and forestry freeholders may effectively block implementation of zoning districts when they represent less than 50 percent of the titled land ownership within a district, a result that substantively changes the plain meaning of the bill as introduced, considered by the House Local Government Committee, passed by the House, and considered by the Senate Local Government Committee.

If such an interpretation were adopted, one agricultural or forestry freeholder representing a small percentage of the total titled ownership of a proposed zoning district composed of one or two isolated agricultural or forested tracts could effectively block zoning implementation due to that freeholder's ownership of 50 percent of the few such tracts included within the proposed district. This result undermines the basic intent of HB 358 (to create additional protest rights for large landowners controlling 50 percent of the titled property ownership within the district), the legislative intent of the Senate floor amendment (to limit application of the bill's expansion of protest rights), and the ability of county governments to implement zoning districts that include a small number of agricultural or forestry freeholders.

In summary, HB 358 enlarged the protest rights of agricultural and forestry freeholders by amending Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6). The plain language of the statute is ambiguous because it is

capable of two interpretations. Legislative history supports the conclusion that the enlarged protest rights are available to freeholders taxed for agricultural or forest purposes, where their combined title ownership represents at least 50 percent of the total property ownership within the proposed zoning district.

II. Representation of Property Held in Joint and Common Ownership

Your second question frequently has been litigated in other jurisdictions: In the absence of a controlling statute, who may properly sign a protest and represent property held in joint and common ownership? The question arises during judicial scrutiny of zoning protest petitions and petitions concerning improvement districts that contain the signature of one spouse who holds property in some form of cotenancy. The question has also arisen in the context of condominium and partnership ownerships. Resolution of this question is relevant because the burden is upon government "to affirmatively prove that the requisite percentage of the protesting landowners fit within the class of landowners outlined in the statute." See 7 Patrick J. Rohan, Zoning and Land Use Controls § 50.04[4][b], at 140-41 (1995), and cases cited therein; 1 Anderson's American Law of Zoning § 4.34 (4th ed. 1996), and cases cited therein.

These questions have not been resolved by Montana decisional law and the courts of other jurisdictions are split in their conclusions.⁵ Several jurisdictions have reasoned that a joint tenant has the duty to protect the common title; protest provisions typically allow landowners to protect their property from poorly conceived zoning amendments or petitions for improvement. These courts have concluded that the policy of allowing one joint tenant to lodge a valid protest to a proposed change facilitates the duty to protect the common title; finding otherwise would allow a joint tenant to reduce the existing protection of zoning regulation to the commonly-held land by inaction on his or her part.⁶ See, e.g.,

⁵ In Buckley v. Wordal, 262 Mont. 306, 865 P.2d 241 (1993), the Montana Supreme Court considered the joint ownership issue in connection with a protest petition for a rural improvement district. Mont. Code Ann. § 7-12-2109 requires that this form of protest petition "be signed by all owners of the property." The Court found that all the owners listed on the assessment roll for property held jointly must sign in order for their property to be included in the protest. Furthermore, one joint owner may not sign for another without a written power of attorney.

⁶ As previously discussed, Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) applies to the initial zoning of property. The Flathead County situation does not involve the policy consideration whereby a joint or common owner is exercising a duty to protect the stability and

Disco v. Board of Selectmen of Amherst, 347 A.2d 451 (N.H. 1975); Chapman v. County of Will, 304 N.E.2d 287 (Ill. 1973); Bonner v. City of Imperial, 32 N.W.2d 267 (Neb. 1948) (where one joint tenant files objection and another does not a presumption arises that the objecting tenant did so as the representative of the joint tenancy; this presumption prevails unless the contrary is made to appear).

The other line of cases holds that all owners must sign a protest to allow property held jointly or in common to be included as part of a calculated protest area. The reasoning of these cases varies; several courts have recognized that one cotenant is not the "owner" of the property for purposes of these statutes. See Woldan v. City of Stamford, 164 A.2d 306 (Conn. C.P. 1960); Warren v. Borawski, 37 A.2d 364 (Conn. 1944); Marks v. Bettendorf's, Inc., 337 S.W.2d 585, 595 (Mo. Ct. App. 1960); Newton v. Borough of Emporium, 73 A. 984, 985 (Pa. 1909).

Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) refers specifically to the "freeholders representing 50% of the titled property ownership." The general rule is that one freeholder holding a joint or common interest in property may not bind or represent the other joint or common owner without proof of consent or authority. 20 Am. Jur. 2d Cotenancy and Joint Ownership §§ 2, 103 (1995). In the absence of such proof, I conclude that the single signature of a husband or wife or other joint property owner on a protest filed under Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) is insufficient to include commonly or jointly held property in the area of the calculated protest. Where both husband and wife, or several partners, are listed on the assessment rolls for a particular tract of land, all owners must be present on the protest before the land may be included within the area of the calculated protest. To find otherwise presumes that one protesting co-owner or partner represents the interests and better judgment of the silent co-owner or partner; such an undocumented presumption may be misleading and erroneous.


With regard to condominium ownership, courts agree that a condominium owner or purchaser has the right to have the proportionate share of the freehold interest in the land within the particular development included in the protest calculation. See Gentry v. City of Norwalk, 494 A.2d 1206 (Conn. 1985); Upper Keys Citizens Ass'n, Inc. v. Schloesser, 407 So. 2d 1051 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1981). I find this reasoning persuasive. To require all condominium owners to file protests in order to allow inclusion of their undivided interest in the freehold estate would essentially disenfranchise these property owners from operation of Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6).

continuity of existing zoning regulation of land held in joint or common ownership.

THEREFORE, IT IS MY OPINION:

1. Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) enlarges "protest rights" for freeholders whose property is classified for real property tax purposes as agricultural or forest land, where their combined title ownership represents 50 percent of the total property ownership within the proposed or revised zoning district. These enlarged protest rights supplement the protest rights provided to 40 percent of freeholders within the district whose names appear on the last-completed assessment roll.
2. The phrase "freeholders representing 50 percent of the titled property ownership" within Mont. Code Ann. § 76-2-205(6) requires that all owners of property held in joint or common ownership join in the protest for the area of the parcel to be included in the calculation of the protest area. Condominium owners or purchasers are entitled to have their proportionate share of the freehold interest in the land area of the particular development included in the calculation of the protest area.

Sincerely,



JOSEPH P. MAZUREK
Attorney General

jpm/gS/dm